

# SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. VIII, No. 21

P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015

December 15, 1978

## Carter and Science: A Two-Year Scorecard

How have science and technology fared under nearly two years of Jimmy Carter's Administration, and what clues are there as to what lies ahead?

Two points stand out: The first is that the good start that Gerald Ford made in restoring confidence and cooperation between science and government has been strongly carried forward by Mr. Carter to the point where the ravages of the Johnson and Nixon years are forgotten. Despite the dour assessment of government-academic relations recently issued by MIT President Jerome B. Wiesner (SGR Vol. VIII, No. 20), the scientific and academic communities recognize, or ought to, that this Administration is friendly, even if it doesn't deliver everything they want. There are bumps and irritations here and there — such as the allegedly crushing changes threatened in the pending

### *European Universities Feel The "Tenure Jam" — Page 8*

revision of methods for computing indirect costs on government research grants. But in contrast to the vengeful attitude that the White House held toward academe in the late 1960s and early 1970s, there is now a firm congeniality.

The second point is that with the exception of Mr. Carter's efforts to throttle the Clinch River (Tenn.) fast-breeder demonstration plant, there have been no abrupt starts or stops on research-related matters; no new big programs have been suddenly started, none of the old ones has been killed off. Major programs have been initiated for earthquake and climate research, but planning for these long preceded Mr. Carter's arrival in Washington.

The President and his Science Adviser, Frank Press, have publicly spoken of the need to promote stability and predictability in the government's dealings with research and development, and, to the extent that the Executive Branch can exercise control, the trend is in that direction. The difficulty, of course, is that while the White House can prepare neat science-policy packages and carefully designed budgets, R&D jurisdictions are scattered all over Capitol Hill, and what comes down from Congress does not necessarily resemble what went up from the White House.

Blow-by-blow evidence of this is to be found in a report that provides a detailed accounting of how the recently departed 95th Congress responded to Mr.

Carter's budget requests on R&D matters. Prepared by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, with the cooperation of six major professional societies, the report is something new — and very valuable — on the Washington R&D scene: a prompt, postadjournment compilation of the net effects of hundreds of congressional budget actions. (*Congressional Action on Research and Development in the FY 1979 Budget*, 40 pages, available without charge: AAAS, Office of Public Sector Programs, 1776 Massachusetts Ave. N.W., Washington, DC 20036).

What it plainly shows is that when it comes to R&D, Congress is like a bunch of musicians each playing from different sheets of music. This is not to suggest that the White House has a monopoly on wisdom and that any Congressional departure from the Executive design is necessarily a loss for the proper conduct of the government's R&D affairs. Rather, it is to suggest that the fragmentation of R&D matters among over a score of subcommittees — none of which seeks coordination with any other — does tend to work against the achievement of any overall design on R&D.

For example, on the basis of many findings showing  
(Continued on Page 2)

## In Brief

The long-awaited resumption of Senator Kennedy's inquiry into the National Institutes of Health is tentatively scheduled for February. Several hearings, before the Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research, were held in late 1977 and then the subject was set aside as busy Chairman Kennedy got involved with other things.

MIT has announced the appointment of a Committee on the Presidency to select a successor for Jerome B. Wiesner, who is scheduled to retire in June 1980. The Committee, consisting of eight members of the MIT Corporation, is chaired by Carl M. Mueller, vice chairman of the Bankers Trust Co.

While American science-policymakers warn that Europe is outpacing the US in support of research, their European counterparts are warning that Europe is falling behind. As reported in the Common Market newsletter *Euroforum*, the European Research and Development Committee has concluded that "scientific research in Community countries has dropped off alarmingly in comparison to their principal competitors."

## ... Congress Has Its Own Ideas on Research

(Continued from Page 1)

a decade-long erosion in purchasing power for basic research, the Administration sought to increase obligations for Fiscal 1979 by 11.1 per cent above the previous year's figure, so as to come out with a "real" increase of nearly five per cent. However, though the overall goal is stated in one lump figure, the political reality is that money for basic research is handled by a flock of separate agencies, most of which, in turn, come under separate authorization and appropriations subcommittees in the House and Senate.

As can be seen from the accompanying tables, some of these subcommittees piled on the cash — especially so in the case of the National Institutes of Health, an old Congressional favorite. In other instances, however, and for one reason or another, the request for a specific agency was trimmed. With these ups and downs averaged out, the net effect, according to the AAAS analysis, was a 9.3 per cent increase, rather than the 11.1 percent sought in the basic research budget — but a good deal of that increase is confined to NIH, which came out 19 per cent above the Administration's request and 33.6 per cent above last year's appropriation.

Meanwhile, with the inflation factor now projected at a minimum of 7 per cent, a number of agencies will either be losing ground or merely standing still. There is no need to view this as a modernday tragedy, since the nation and its scientific enterprise will survive Congress' patchwork treatment of the R&D budget. But there is obviously considerable room for improvement in legislative handling of these matters, perhaps through some revision of the Budget Act of 1974, which provides for a lot more coherence in the processing of the President's budget requests — though not down to the level of trying to regard R&D in any comprehensive fashion.

With the Administration's design for financially rehabilitating basic research somewhat mangled both by Congress and by an unanticipated surge in the rate of inflation, interest in Washington science-policy circles is now directed toward the budget that Mr. Carter

### Basic Research by Agency (Budget authority in millions)

#### CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON R&D IN THE FY 1979 BUDGET

	FY 1979 Budget	Action by Congress Approved	Change	Percent From Budget	Change From 1978
Health, Education & Welfare (National Institutes of Health) (HEW, Other)	\$ 989.1 (856.0)	\$1,142.5 (1,019.0)	\$ +153.4 (+163.0)	+15.5% (+19.0)	+32.9% (+33.6)
	(133.1)	(123.5)	(- 9.6)	(- 7.2)	(+28.1)
National Science Foundation	754.9	741.9	- 13.0	- 1.7	+ 7.8
National Aeronautics & Space Administration	519.8	513.1	- 6.7	- 1.3	+ 9.6
Energy	467.5	465.5	- 2.0	- 0.4	+ 7.6
Defense	363.9	354.7	- 9.2	- 2.5	+10.8
Agriculture	251.9	256.2	+ 4.3	+ 1.7	+ 9.0
Interior	164.3	164.3	—	—	+ 4.6
Commerce	31.7	30.4	- 1.3	- 4.1	+10.9
Smithsonian	33.0	33.0	—	—	+ 5.8
Environmental Protection Agency	30.0	24.0	- 6.0	-20.0	+14.2
Others	30.6	30.6	—	—	+10.1
<b>TOTAL, Basic Research</b>	<b>\$3,636.7</b>	<b>\$3,756.2</b>	<b>\$ +119.5</b>	<b>+ 3.3%</b>	<b>+15.0%</b>

Source: AAAS

will send to Congress next month. While, as we have frequently reported, the President keeps telling his budget planners and agency heads that R&D are to be accorded especially kind treatment, SGR hears from inside the budget deliberations that the Office of Management and Budget is nonetheless scrutinizing R&D items with the same cost-cutting diligence that it applies to most other items. And we are advised that with every interest group in Washington proclaiming the necessity for exemption from budget stringency next year, hopes should not get too high for special treatment for R&D — regardless of Presidential assurances to the contrary.

(Continued on Page 3)

© Science & Government Report, Inc., 1978

ISSN 0048-9581

Contributing Editor  
**Anne Roark**

Editor and Publisher  
**Daniel S. Greenberg**

European Correspondents  
**Michael Kenward (London)**  
**Francois Segulier (Paris)**

Circulation Manager  
**Alice Anne Freund**

Independently published by *Science & Government Report, Inc.*, twice monthly, except once each in January, July and August. Annual Subscription: Institutions, \$84.50 (two years, \$149.50); individuals, \$44 (two years, \$75). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms.

## ... Innovation Study Will Spur Changes

(Continued from Page 2)

In fact, what's going to be especially interesting to observe is whether the Administration will permit NIH to consume the big extra helping of money that Congress added to the President's budget. With the President seeking to maintain a firm image as an inflation fighter and deficit reducer, his budget people are searching everywhere for cuttable items, and among those they have identified is that premium appropriation for NIH.

Looking to next year, one of the most important things in the works is the big study that the Commerce Department is conducting on problems of industrial innovation and related matters. Headed by Jordan Baruch, Assistant Secretary for Science and Technology, and involving the close collaboration of the White House science office, the study is scheduled to be completed in April. And, unless it concludes that everything is more or less okay — which, of course, it won't — the study is certain to spawn a series of proposals for legislative and administrative changes. At this point, it is possible only to guess the specific areas that might be involved, but on the basis of what the study's various panels of specialists have been looking into, there appears to be a lot of interest in patents, academic-industrial R&D linkups, the encouragement of industry-wide research associations, and new sources of venture capital. A main objective of the study is to determine how the federal government can both encourage industrial innovation and avoid impeding it. According to Baruch, industry, after some initial doubts, has responded enthusiastically to requests for participation in the study, and he's optimistic that the findings will be sound and influential.

As for any big new federally supported R&D ventures in the next year or so, the indications simply are that there won't be any. Despite Congressional efforts to expand the space program, the Administration prefers to stick to a modest effort and to encourage industry to commercialize existing space capabilities.

In the biomedical area, despite Congress's favorable treatment of NIH, there is no interest in any follow-up to the National Cancer Program extravaganza. HEW Secretary Joseph Califano's big 5-year planning scheme for NIH (SGR Vol. VIII, No. 17) is still in the early stages and assuming that it survives — which is by no means certain, given the distaste that it has evoked — its main effect will be to hold down spending; that, after all, is what Califano says is one of its main purposes.

What's worthy of note, however, is that Califano is virtually alone in pushing this scheme, and that if he goes on to some other job in the Administration — a

move now and then rumored — the whole exercise is very likely to be dropped. The White House science office had no role in the Califano decision to prod NIH and its clients into agreeing on a set of "health-research principles." In fact, at that presidential outpost in science-government affairs, the Secretary's activities in this matter are not regarded with esteem. As for the NIH bureaucracy, it is dutifully following the Secretary's instructions, but in asking around out there at Bethesda, SGR has not come upon much enthusiasm. In searching for growth areas, even small ones, it appears that nutrition research is coming on fast. The Department of Agriculture is enlarging its work in this field, and, as always, there's strong Congressional support for both agriculture and health

(Continued on Page 4)

### CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON R&D IN THE FY 1979 BUDGET

(Budget authority in millions)

R&D in FY 1979 Budget, January 1978	\$29,197.0
Budget amendments (net)	+ 50.5
R&D in FY 1979 Budget as amended	\$29,247.5
<b>Congressional actions:</b>	
<b>Increases</b>	
NIH	\$351.7
Energy	271.2
Agriculture	71.0
Interior	27.7
Veterans	10.1
TVA	6.0
EPA	2.9
<b>Total increases</b>	\$+ 740.6
<b>Reductions</b>	
Defense	\$328.8
NSF	25.4
NASA	21.4
HEW other than NIH	13.1
Commerce	10.7
AID	7.8
Other major agencies	17.9
<b>Total reductions</b>	\$- 425.1
<b>Net change by Congress</b>	(+ 315.5)
<b>TOTAL R&amp;D approved by Congress</b>	\$29,563.0

Source: AAAS

**Federal R&D obligations by function: Fiscal years 1969-79**

Source: NSF

[Dollars in millions]

Function	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979
<b>Total</b> . . . . .	\$15,641	\$15,340	\$15,545	\$16,498	\$16,800	\$17,415	\$18,988	\$20,724	\$23,929	\$26,419	\$27,972
National defense . . . . .	8,356	7,981	8,110	8,902	9,002	9,016	9,679	10,430	11,864	12,786	13,833
Space . . . . .	3,732	3,510	2,893	2,714	2,601	2,478	2,511	2,863	3,066	3,141	3,383
Health . . . . .	1,127	1,126	1,338	1,589	1,624	2,096	2,177	2,366	2,604	2,911	3,034
Energy development and conversion . . . . .	435	425	422	475	535	665	1,186	1,439	2,301	2,862	2,827
Environment . . . . .	285	322	434	503	620	659	795	847	954	1,066	1,082
Science and tech- nology base . . . . .	436	449	463	543	550	641	713	785	901	988	1,061
Transportation and communications . . . . .	458	590	779	615	630	703	641	636	705	829	837
Natural resources . . . . .	199	234	321	351	338	332	398	433	500	608	644
Food, fiber and other agricultural products . . . . .	225	241	247	291	297	292	350	388	459	532	543
Income security and social services . . . . .	97	106	128	125	157	134	149	133	159	182	207
Education . . . . .	155	147	186	191	214	173	149	142	120	137	146
Area and community development, housing, and public services . . . . .	49	91	89	87	97	96	102	104	107	139	129
Economic growth and productivity . . . . .	56	80	93	57	67	66	62	77	86	90	101
International coopera- tion and development . . . . .	27	32	32	29	33	27	30	44	72	74	97
Crime prevention and control . . . . .	5	9	10	25	35	36	46	36	32	73	48

**BUDGET** (Continued from Page 3)

related activities, which means that requests for money for this long-neglected field are receiving favorable responses.

Defense R&D involves such astronomical sums that even though Congress cut \$328 million from the President's request, the remaining amounts are more than ample for maintaining the Defense Department's role as the country's biggest R&D agency. Of special interest to academe was the Congress's refusal to permit Defense to inaugurate a new program — a mere \$9 million in the first year — to finance basic research in the academic community. The rationale for this program was that DoD-academic links have never been restored to their pre-Vietnam condition, and that defense research is suffering as a result. Congress saw the matter differently, however, and turned down the program on the grounds that it was poorly designed and unnecessary.

The AAAS budget study, written by Willis H. Shapley and Don I. Phillips, speculates, on the basis of Congressional cuts in research requests for Defense,

"that funding levels for military R&D may be reaching a saturation point beyond which further increases are not supportable in terms of hard requirements . . . In recent years," they add, "'continued real growth' in total Defense R&D spending (and in the total Defense budget) has come to be a policy objective in its own right, as an earnest of the resolve to maintain a strong position vis-a-vis the USSR. We may now be approaching a point of diminishing returns where this policy objective requires reconsideration."

SGR thinks that the authors are too optimistic about the possibility of holding down Defense R&D, which, as can be seen from the table on this page has usually managed to receive annual increases, with especially big ones since 1974.

In any case, the overall prospects for government support of R&D in 1979 are neither glittering nor depressing. The likelihood is for a bit of real growth, sensitivity to the problems of the research community, and some efforts to stabilize the support of research and perhaps reduce some of the more exasperating red tape that comes with government money. — DSG



## NSF Chief Urges Response to Research Critics

*In an unusually tart speech last month at Indiana University, NSF Director Richard C. Atkinson administered a rhetorical drubbing to politicians (unnamed) who ridicule research; to the press, for mindlessly reporting such sniping, and to the scientific community, for failure to make itself better understood by public. Following are some highlights from that talk, titled, "Federally Supported Research—Fiction and Fact":*

What strikes me as curious is that both the highly articulate critics of federally funded basic research and those who disseminate the criticisms in artfully slanted news stories do not seem to harbor any deep emotional hostility to scientific inquiry. To a connoisseur of these charges of wastefulness, it is often apparent that those who level the charges are seeking to arouse a public indignation which they themselves do not share. The accounts are often labored, and sometimes even playful, so that the net result is more of a teasing put-down of scientists than a serious indictment of government waste. Yet even light-hearted spoofing seems to trigger the same indignation and hostility as accounts which are dead pan or prosecutorial in tone.

I suspect the ready market for reports of seemingly cockeyed and wasteful research reflects a fundamental sense of uncertainty and perhaps suspicion of intellectual endeavors that lie outside our everyday experience. The message I get from the public's receptivity to this line of reporting is roughly this: Whatever you scientists are doing, we want some assurance that these government-supported activities are connected with real human concerns and problems. If this reading is correct, it means that the scientific community will be far more likely to gain acceptance by dealing with these concerns in a patient and serious way than by reacting in an ill-tempered or patronizing fashion. Americans can put up with just about anything but arrogance, pomposity, or elitism.

This brings us to the relationship between the American scientific community and its public patrons. . . .

While public support of science is not a right, the acceptance of such support imposes upon the grantee an important obligation. This is accountability. . . .

I suspect there is a tendency in the scientific community to view this accountability as simply a matter of reporting expenditures under a grant or certifying compliance with various laws and regulations. I would argue, however, that accountability is considerably broader than this. I believe it also includes an obligation to explain to the lay public in understandable terms not only the purpose of research, but more generally, what the scientific undertaking is all about.

What I am talking about is communication. Scientists communicate extremely well with other scientists, but when it comes to the general public, scientists do poorly. . . .

What disturbs me is that many scientists seem to find this form of communication with the public somehow demeaning, or worse still, fear it may threaten their standing among scientific colleagues. . . .

. . . One of my most vivid recollections [of a recent visit to Peking] is a toast which Vice Premier Fang Yi delivered. In this toast he remarked: "The most serious damage perpetrated by the Gang of Four was the suppression of basic research. Everything had to be practical." It seems somewhat paradoxical to me that the present Chinese leadership has grasped this lesson so thoroughly at a time when American opinion seems increasingly uncertain of the value of basic research and scholarship.

### ACS Shuns Federal Funds

Apparently in response to charges that it has a selfish interest in boosting federal spending for cancer research and treatment, the American Cancer Society has decided to reject any further government funds and rely entirely on contributions from the general public.

Relative to the ACS's general resources, the decision, recently approved by its House of Delegates, does not involve much money. Overall fundraising this year netted a record of nearly \$125 million, of which only \$1.7 million was in local, state, or government funds for joint projects with the ACS. But for the ACS, which has drawn a lot of adverse publicity for stampeding the National Cancer Institute into an ill-advised mammography program — since scaled down — financial detachment from the government is obviously worth more than the money that it will have to forsake.

According to an ACS press release, Judge Joseph H. Young, chairman of the board, said that "The action will further strengthen the Society's position as an objective champion of the public which supports it, and in particular as a guardian of the interests of cancer patients and their families. Henceforth, when we speak out in favor of larger appropriations for the National Cancer Institute, no one will be able to suggest that there's any financial advantage in it for us."

The transition to non-government funding will begin immediately, though a small number of projects will be permitted to phase out over several years.

## DOE Establishes New R&D Board

The Department of Energy, much criticized for alleged deficiencies in its research programs, has appointed a large and diverse advisory board to provide counsel on its activities in that area.

But with 22 members listed as "initial" appointees, and meetings scheduled for only "at least" four times a year, the girth of the membership and the infrequency of assemblage do not suggest that DOE is looking to saddle itself with a powerhouse of outside advice. The law of "small-and-often" generally applies to influential advisory groups, but, of course, there can be exceptions. In any case, the members are:

Solomon Buchsbaum, Bell Labs, chairman  
James Fletcher, University of Pittsburgh, vice chairman  
Ivan L. Bennett, NYU Medical School  
Oliver Boileau, Boeing Aerospace  
David Bradford, Princeton University  
Thomas Cochran, Natural Resources Defense Council  
James Connor, First Boston Corp.  
Lloyd Cooke, Economic Development Council, NY  
Edward E. David Jr., Exxon Research and Engineering  
Denis Hayes, Worldwatch Institute  
Richard L. Hinman, Pfizer, Inc.  
Charles Hitch, Resources for the Future  
John P. Holdren, UC Berkeley  
Margaret Kivelson, UCLA  
James Pitts, UC Berkeley  
Eric Reichl, Conoco Coal  
Sidney Drell, Stanford Accelerator  
Eugene Fubini, consultant, Wash., DC  
John Gibbons, University of Tennessee  
Carl Savit, Western Geophysical Co.  
Thomas E. Stelson, Georgia Institute of Technology  
Victoria Tschinkel, Florida Dept. of Environmental Regulations

## OTA Science Division Chief

Gerald O. Barney, a physicist temporarily serving on the staff of the Council on Environmental Quality, has been appointed head of the Science, Information and Transportation Division of the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment.

Barney, who is on loan to the Council from Rockefeller Brothers Fund, will join OTA January 1, following the scheduled completion of a CEQ study for the White House on world trends in population, resources and the environment.

## Energy Education Inventory

*Energy Education Materials Inventory*, a 293-page bibliography of energy-related books, films, curriculum guides, etc., for kindergarten through 12th grade, is available for \$5.25 per copy from the US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. Specify GPO No. 061-000-00183-2.

## High-Vacuum Advice

*The following excerpt is from the conclusion to "The Health of the Scientific and Technical Enterprise," a recently released report to the Office of Technology Assessment, prepared by an advisory panel "coordinated" by Donald F. Hornig, White House science adviser under Lyndon Johnson.*

We have concluded that in many respects the scientific and technical enterprise resembles a living organism in that it is composed of closely interacting organs, none of which can be meaningfully isolated from the whole. Hence, the design of indicators, qualitative as well as quantitative, can profit by considering the corresponding problem of diagnosis and evaluation in medicine. There, too, health is an ambiguous term, but separating the considerations relating to various levels of immediacy, e.g., 25 current illness (sic), future prognosis, and overall long-term fitness is a useful step in the analysis. Confusion results when the levels are intermingled in diagnosis as well as prescription. If the several meanings of health are examined separately, however, we believe that Congress and the administration, as well as the universities and industry, will be in a better position to assess the situation and to develop further indicators. According to this way of looking at things, indicators are like symptoms and laboratory tests; some may be qualitative and others quantitative. Taken individually, they may or may not identify a disease or source of future concern, but taken together in proper relation to each other, they may be very revealing . . . To maintain and improve the health of the scientific and technical enterprise we must constantly work at identifying further criteria and indicators which will help to diagnose the needs of this fragile and imperfectly understood undertaking. As with human health, a perennial series of checkups is unavoidable. Then it only remains to follow the diagnosis with action.

## Fire Research Director

Frederic B. Clarke has been appointed director of the Center for Fire Research, which is part of the National Bureau of Standards. Formerly deputy director of the Center, Clarke was appointed acting director last January, succeeding John Lyons, who became director of the NBS National Engineering Laboratory. Clarke holds a PhD in chemistry from Harvard and was a congressional staff member.

## US, Japan to Cooperate on Fusion Research

Some big-league Japanese-American technological programs now appear certain to get underway as a result of the so-called Fukuda Initiative, whose namesake, the former Japanese premier, urged the two countries to collaborate in R&D.

Following a series of meetings between technical specialists from each side, it's been decided to start off with joint programs in magnetic fusion and coal conversion; meanwhile, consideration is being given to projects on solar energy conversion, geothermal energy and high-energy physics. To oversee the collaborative efforts, a US-Japan Joint Committee, consisting of three members from each country, is to be established.

The projects that are being developed under these collaborative arrangements represent one of the least-

noticed growth areas in R&D today. With the US R&D budget more or less static, word is going out to federal R&D agencies that if they can sign up foreign collaborators to share the costs, the Office of Management and Budget is more likely to look favorably upon their aspirations.

In the past, there has been a bit of cost-sharing by other nations, mainly in oceanography programs run by the National Science Foundation, plus in some NASA programs. The Japanese-American ventures now going ahead are generally on a much larger scale than preceding efforts. Though budgets have not yet been announced, the projects are big ones, according to administration officials—mostly in the \$100 million and upwards category.

Orders Now Being Accepted for the New Edition of

## Science & Government Report International Almanac

Pre-publication orders, at a substantially reduced price, are now being accepted for the new edition of SGR International Almanac. Following upon the first edition, which was published last year, the forthcoming volume will consist of original review articles on science-policy developments in all the industrialized and major developing countries, plus the texts of major science-policy documents issued over the past year. Written by leading science-policy specialists from over 20 countries, SGR International Almanac has won wide acclaim as a standard text in its field.

**SGR International Almanac is "a needed book for all those who want a broad picture of science**

**policy" — H. Guyford Stever, Director, National Science Foundation, 1972-76.**

**The SGR Almanac "is indispensable to any serious student of science policy" — Edward E. David Jr., White House Science Adviser, 1970-73, currently President of the AAAS and President of Exxon Research and Engineering Corp.**

Publication is scheduled for June 1979, at which time the price per copy will be \$75.

Pre-publication orders are now being accepted at \$54 per copy, or, in combination with the first edition, at \$85 for the two volumes.

SGR International Almanac

PO Box 6226

Washington, DC 20015

Please enter my order for:

- ☐ The 1979 edition of SGR International Almanac at the reduced price of \$54 per copy.
- ☐ The 1979 edition, in combination with the previous edition, at the reduced combination price of \$85.
- ☐ check enclosed      ☐ please bill

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Please make checks payable to SGR International Almanac

If not satisfied, a full refund will be made upon return of your purchase.

## Job Shortage Hits European Universities

Echoing reports of tenure jams and a depressed job market in American universities, the European Science Foundation says that the problems are present in many of Europe's universities and research institutions, and are getting worse.

In its annual report, the ESF — a meeting ground for government agencies that support research in Europe — reports that “in a large number of European countries, the age-distribution of teaching personnel in universities and other research institutes has reached a level at which 50 per cent, or, in some cases, even 60 per cent, of this personnel has an average of about 40 years.” The ESF adds that “the majority of those now in employment will stay in office until the beginning of the 1990s, when they will reach their normal retirement age. The demand for replacements during the next fifteen years will be exceedingly low.”

Several factors contribute to this distressing picture. To begin with, research and education have taken their share of the recent bout of budget slashing that has gone on throughout most of Europe. Secondly, the boom in university expansion that took place in the 1960s is over. In Britain, for example, there are enough university places for any secondary school graduate who wants to study science; indeed, many universities have places going begging, a state of affairs that some university teachers fear has reduced the standards as universities seek to keep their lectures halls filled.

Financial constraints and a freeze on university

expansion have all but fossilized the faculties of many institutions. This, in turn, has jeopardized the career prospects of many younger academics. As the ESF's annual report puts it, “The chance for a junior research assistant to reach a permanent university appointment has gone down from about 70 per cent during the 1960s to about 15 per cent in the present decade.”

Uncertainty over employment prospects means that researchers are increasingly reluctant to accept fellowships abroad. “The risk of losing a small chance which may exist at home seems too great for them to follow the previous path of a scientist's training which included work experience in other countries . . . The mobility of researchers, which all of us have felt to be instrumental in international and especially in European scientific cooperation, seems to be seriously endangered.”

A similar picture emerges from this year's annual report of the British Science Research Council. This is the first report presented by Professor Geoffrey Allen, who last year took over as chairman of the SRC. The country's science departments are, says Allen, “all growing old together.” He wants the SRC and the University Grants Committee — which meets the costs of running the universities, including academics' salaries, while the SRC meets the costs of specific scientific projects — to try to persuade the government that, to prevent total stagnation, university science and engineering departments should employ some young faculty members.

Science & Government Report  
Northwest Station  
Box 6226A  
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid  
at Washington, D.C.

### SGR Holiday Schedule

The next issue of Science & Government Report will be published January 15, 1979.

-00006 99/99  
XEROX UNIV MICROFILMS  
300 N ZEEB RD  
ANN ARBOR MI 48106



